

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated May 18, 2005. Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 17, and 19 to 25 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 13 and 25 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 5, 7 to 14 and 19 to 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,366,909 (Yuasa) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,175,850 (Hirata) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,748,383 (Wada). Claims 3, 4, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yuasa, Hirata and Wada, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,209,124 (Vermeire). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The present invention generally concerns conducting a search of data which includes binary data and meta-data. A predetermined number of data is selected from data registered in a database, and a list of information is displayed which corresponds to the selected data. Meta-data contained in the data selected from the list is displayed. A search condition is set from the displayed meta-data. A search is conducted of the data registered in the database based on the set search condition. According to one feature of the invention, the display of information corresponding to data which does not actually exist in the database is prohibited, and a registration of such data is deleted.

By virtue of the foregoing, in which the display of data which does not actually exist in a database is prohibited and the registration of such data is deleted, the movement or deletion of data to be searched can be automatically reflected in the registry of a database, while being transparent to a user.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claims 1, 13 and 25 are respectively directed to an apparatus, a method and a storage medium.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention of the subject application. In particular, Yuasa, Hirata, Wada and Vermeire are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of prohibiting the display of information corresponding to data which does not actually exist in a database, and deleting a registration of such data.

The Office Action acknowledges that Yuasa and Hirata do not disclose the claimed feature of prohibiting the display of information corresponding to data which does not actually exist in a database, and deleting a registration of such data. However, the Office Action cites to Wada for this alleged disclosure.

As understood by Applicant, Wada discloses a geographic information indicator in which a data unregistered area, or an area of a master database where no data is registered, is added to a local database. Wada also discloses that an inquiry with respect to the data unregistered area to a database server can be deleted, and meaningless inquiries to the database server can allegedly be reduced. See Wada, column 14, line 50 to column 15, line 4; and Figure 13.

However, Wada is not seen to disclose or suggest prohibiting the display of information, muchless that such information corresponds to data which does not actually exist in a database. Rather, Wada merely discloses that a database unregistered area is added to a local database. In addition, Wada is not seen to disclose or suggest deleting a registration of data which does not actually exist in the database, from the database. In Wada, it is an inquiry to a database server with respect to the data unregistered area that is

deleted, and not a registration of data which does not actually exist in the database. Furthermore, Wada is not seen to disclose or suggest the attendant benefits provided by such prohibition and deletion. Accordingly, Wada is not seen to disclose or suggest prohibiting the display of information corresponding to data which does not actually exist in a database, and deleting a registration of such data.

In addition, Vermeire has been reviewed and is not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Yuasa, Hirata and Wada.


Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 13 and 25 are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
John D. Magluyan
Registration No. 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 100353v1